

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/731,792 12/09/2003 Barry Wixey 275A-455/DVB 4916 EXAMINER 27572 7590 06/21/2004 HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. SELF, SHELLEY M P.O. BOX 828 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303 3725

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  |   |   | $\mathcal{A}$                                    |
|--|---|---|--|
| Office Action Summary  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)  | - 9  |
|  | 10/731,792  | WIXEY ET AL.  | r/t  |
|  | Examiner  | Art Unit  | <del>                                     </del> |
|  | Shelley Self  | 3725  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply   |   |   |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL'   | V IS SET TO EXPIR   | PE 2 MONTH(S) FROM  |  |
| THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period volume to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, howeve<br>y within the statutory minim<br>will apply and will expire SIX<br>, cause the application to be | r, may a reply be timely filed  um of thirty (30) days will be considered tim ( (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this scome ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |
| Status   |   |   |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on   |   |   |  |
| 2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.  |   |   |  |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is   |   |   |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under E   | Ex parte Quayle, 19   | 35 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.   |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |   |   | /  |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application   |   |   |  |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.   |   |   |  |
| 5) Claim(s) <u>27</u> is/are allowed.  |   |   |  |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 11-14</u> is/are rejected.   |   |   |  |
| 7) Claim(s) <u>2-10 and 15-26</u> is/are objected to.  |   |   |  |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o   | r election requirem   | ent.  |  |
| Application Papers   |   |   |  |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  |   |   |  |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>01 March 1209</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.   |   |   |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |   |   |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).   |   |   |  |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.  |   |   |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |   |   |  |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  |   |   |  |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:   |   |   |  |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  |   |   |  |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.  |   |   |  |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage  |   |   |  |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  |   |   |  |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.   |   |   |  |
|  |   |   |  |
| Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | <b>4</b> ) □ 1=   | terview Summary (PTO-413)   |  |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date  |   |   |  |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)   |   | otice of Informal Patent Application (P   | PTO-152)   |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/8/04</u> .  | 6) LI (I  | ther:   |  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the first and second stop (clm. 1, 11) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. With regard to the claims, the specification does not provide antecedent bases for the following terms, "height setting device", "first stop", "second stop", and "adjustment portion "and" pivot point.

Additionally, the specification fails to provide support for "...the second stop being coupled to the other one of the base and the carriage assembly, the second stop including an adjustment portion".

Art Unit: 3725

With regard to claims 1 and 15, the claims imply that the "adjustment portion" can be affixed to either the base or the carriage, however the specification fails to provide support for two such embodiments. Correction is required.

Claim 1 would be allowable if re-written to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection(s).

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 11-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 11, the claim fails to positively recite any critical interrelationship between the base and the carriage. Correction is required.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 11-13, as best as can be understood are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Campbell et al. (6,585,017). Campbell discloses a power planer (1) comprising a base (408), a carriage (200) that is movable along an axis (fig. 3), a cutting tool (58,46), that is

carried by the carriage, a setting device (21, 22) having a first and second stop (9-12, 42, 44; col. 5, lines 37-40), the first stop being including a threaded member and nut (6, 9; fig. 4) and including a pin coupled to one of the base and the carriage, the second stop coupled to the other one of the base and the carriage, the setting device being operable for preventing a distance between a reference surface and the cutting plane from being set to a dimension that is smaller than a selected dimension, the selected dimension being selected from a plurality of predetermined dimensions (col. 5, lines 37-46) that are defined by contact between the first and second stops when the carriage is moved toward the base.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 14 as best as can be understood is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell et al. (6,585,017). Campbell does not disclose the pin to be selectable from a group of differently sized pins. However, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to the skilled artisan to select a pin from a selection of pin sizes. To select a pin sized/dimensioned to best fit the invention is well within routine engineering practice. Such selection would not have been unobvious, unusual or garnered an unexpected result.

Application/Control Number: 10/731,792

Art Unit: 3725

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 27 allowed.

Claims 2-10 and 15-26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but

Page 5

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base

claim and any intervening claims and if any 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection(s) were overcome.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Shelley Self whose telephone number is (703) 305-5299. The

examiner can normally be reached Mon-Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm. If attempts to reach the

examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor, Allen Ostrager can be

reached at (703) 308-3136. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application

or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular and After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIE or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SSelf

June 15, 2004

ALLEN OSTRAGER SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700**